COD TERM FACULTY RENEWAL and ADVANCEMENT REVIEW DOSSIER TEMPLATE FOR 2024-2025

Term faculty appointments are eligible for renewal based upon the quality of performance and the continuing need of the unit. Term faculty members, full-time and part-time, shall be reviewed by an appropriate faculty committee **before the end of the third year after the initial appointment date** (*Faculty Handbook Chapters 3 and 5* on term faculty appointment, evaluation, and advancement). Peer reviews shall take place every three years (excluding annual reviews) or at appointment renewal time, whichever is greater. This process is separate from the faculty member's annual review.

Renewal reviews must include peer review.

PROCESS FOR A TERM FACULTY RENEWAL REVIEW

The department chair is responsible for coordinating with term faculty members to discuss their intentions regarding renewal or to initiate the mandatory review based on their years of service. This review typically occurs every three years (refer to the Faculty Handbook, as well as college and departmental governance documents for specific guidelines). Once it is decided that renewal is appropriate, the faculty member is responsible for preparing the necessary renewal review documents.

Term faculty members seeking renewal must submit their renewal packet to their Departmental Partner by **March 15th**, one year before the renewal date, unless otherwise specified in the departmental governance document. The Departmental Partner will then collaborate with the department chair to initiate the departmental review process.

Dates	Action
March 15	Term faculty member submits the renewal review packet to department partner and the departmental review begins.
April 15	The department committee writes a letter of evaluation, addressed to the department chair.
April 30	The Department Chair submits contract renewal decision to the Senior Associate Dean and the HR Coordinator.
May 15	Deadline for renewal contract or notice of non-renewal to be sent.

The faculty member is responsible for providing the following information for the review process, unless otherwise stipulated by the respective departmental governance document.

- Section 1, reviewed for accuracy by the department chair
 - o All Position Responsibility Statements (PRS) since initial appointment or last review
 - $\circ~$ A current vita organized according to the Vita Guidelines on the bottom of this document.
 - (The vita is a listing of the candidate's faculty activities and accomplishments put together by the candidate. The Faculty Handbook, 5.3.1., includes details on what to include.)
 - Organize all entries in each section in reverse chronological order most recent first, oldest last.
 - Indicate role/contribution in co-authored or collaborative efforts.

- Highlight activities and accomplishments pertinent to the current promotion and/or tenure review.
- Items should not be replicated. List accomplishments only once and place in the appropriate section.
- Section 2
 - A summary of candidate accomplishments, not to exceed 10 pages. The summary should follow the college's narrative guidelines and provide detail and context regarding the candidate's accomplishments during the review period.
 - Included within the 10 pages should be a numerical summary of teaching evaluations since the last advancement or previous 5 of years.
 - Optional supplementary portfolio of selected works can be included. Refer to the CELT Guidance regarding teaching portfolio examples.

Review materials will be submitted electronically via a CyBox folder that is set up by and maintained by the Departmental Partner.

Department Review and Recommendation: The departmental review committee consists of term faculty members of equal or higher rank (unless otherwise specified by departmental governance documents). If there are not enough qualified term faculty within the department to form a committee, term faculty from other departments may serve, and tenured or tenure-track faculty may also participate if needed. The committee's role is to participate in the review process by assessing the faculty member's renewal materials and drafting an evaluation letter to the department chair.

The committee's recommendation should focus on evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of the case, rather than merely summarizing the process or the faculty member's CV. It is recommended to address any concerns upfront, dealing with them directly and clearly. The committee's evaluation is based on the evidence provided by the candidate relative to the PRS. The committee then submits this document to the department chair, discusses the findings, and offers advice. The outcomes of these reviews play a crucial role in renewal decisions. The evaluation letter must include the names and ranks of the faculty members involved in the review. This letter is confidential and is not shared with the faculty member seeking renewal.

Department Chair's Review and Contract Renewal: The department chair is responsible for reviewing both the faculty member's renewal materials and the evaluation provided by the department review committee. After conducting an independent review, the department chair will decide whether to renew the faculty member's employment contract and determine the terms of renewal. The results of the review and any recommendations should be communicated to the faculty member as soon as possible. The department chair will then collaborate with the Senior Associate Dean and the HR Coordinator to process the necessary renewal or non-renewal documents as appropriate.

PROCESS FOR TERM FACULTY ADVANCEMENT REVIEW

Please number all pages of the dossier consecutively, beginning with the Cover Sheet as page 1. Organization and responsibility of sections:

- The Department Chair completes the cover sheet.
- Sections 1 & 2 are the responsibility of the candidate in consultation with the department review committee or chair. The candidate and the department should both review and approve these sections for factual accuracy. Optional supplementary materials can be included to support this section. Please refer to CELT regarding teaching portfolio examples.
- Section 3 includes two parts. The first part is written by the Department Review Committee, independent of the candidate. The second part is the Chair's recommendation.

Once the dossier is completed, it should be submitted to the Dean's Office for the Dean's review.

Please review the best practices and resources provided by the Provost Office as you begin the advancement process: https://www.provost.iastate.edu/faculty-success/advancement/term-advancement

Dates	Action
November 1	Term faculty member submits the advancement review packet to department partner and the departmental review begins.
December 1	The department committee writes a letter of evaluation, addressed to the department chair.
February 1	The review packet submitted to Dean for review.
March 1	The review packet submitted to the Provost for review and decision.

Candidate Cover Sheet for

Term Faculty Advancement Recommendation

College of _____

Candidate Information				
Full Name:	College:			
Current Rank:	Primary Department:			
Secondary Appointments (e.g., Interdepartmental Program):				
Highest Degree Earned and Field:				
Institution and Year Highest Degree Conferred:				
Date of First Hire at Iowa State: Start Date of Term Appointment at Rank:				
Date of Last Advancement (if applicable):				
Formal appointment in Extension and Outreach? Yes No				

Term Faculty Advancement Review

Action being considered:

Advancement to associate professor rank

Advancement to professor rank

For Department Chairs				
I have reviewed the candidate information. It is factual and accurate to my knowledge. Any errors have been corrected in this final version.				
Department chair signature:	_Date:			

SECTION I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 1. Candidate's Name:
 - a. Candidate's Department:
- 2. Proposed Rank:
- 3. Degrees Held (beginning with the most recent degree) in tabular form:
 - Degree Institution Date Field/Discipline
- 4. Professional Experience in tabular form:
 - a. Academic Positions held elsewhere Dates
 - b. Academic Positions held at Iowa State University Dates
- 5. Number of academic years during which the candidate has taught at least one course at ISU.

(Note: candidates at the assistant rank may be considered for advancement to the associate level after completing five years of employment as a faculty member at ISU—or pre-approved equivalent experience at the time of appointment.)

- 6. Position Responsibility Statements (include copies of both current PRS from Workday and any prior PRS statements operative during the period of review. Documents should be signed by the candidate and the department chair)
- 7. Curriculum Vitae

CURRICULUM VITA

(Examples include but are not limited to the following. Refer to <u>FH</u> 5.3.1.3, College of Design Governance Document, and Departmental Governance Documents for further examples.).

SCHOLARSHIP (if relevant)

Books

Year Full bibliographic entry & contribution, e.g., sole author, co-author, editor, co-editor, etc.

Curated Exhibitions

Year Title of Exhibition Venue

Journal Articles – Peer Reviewed

Year Full bibliographic entry

Conference Proceedings – Peer Reviewed

Year Full bibliographic entry

Book Chapters

Year Full bibliographic entry

Other Publications

Year Full bibliographic entry

Workshop/Training Curricula

Year Full bibliographic entry

Juried Exhibitions

Year Exhibition name, gallery/museum name, location, juror name(s) and professional affiliation(s), title of piece or pieces included in exhibition, award if received, e.g. best of show, first place, second place, etc. Indicate international, national, regional or local, and acceptance rate.

Invited Exhibitions

Year Exhibition name, gallery/museum name, location, juror name(s) and professional affiliation(s), title of piece or pieces included in exhibition, award if received, e.g. best of show, first place, second place, etc. Indicate international, national, regional or local.

Competitions

Year Competition name, competition sponsor, location, juror name(s) and professional affiliation(s), title of competition entry, award received. Indicate international, national, regional or local.

Conference Presentations – Peer Reviewed Abstracts

Year Full bibliographic entry

Invited Lectures and Presentations

Year Full bibliographic entry

Products in Other Media (Videos, Software Applications, Websites, Blogs, etc.)

Year Title as appropriate

Extension / Outreach Reports and Publications

Year Full bibliographic entry

Media Presentations, News Notes, Editorials (about and by), etc.

Year Full bibliographic entry

Inventions and Patents

Year Invention name, description, patent number

Awards and Honors

Year Title, granting organization

Other Scholarly Products / Venues

Year Fellowships, Residencies, Grants, etc. as may be appropriate to area(s) of candidate's expertise

Completed Projects and Programs

Year Name and description

Current Projects and Programs

Year Name and description

Future Projects and Programs

Year Name and description

External Grants and Awards for Research / Creative Activities

Year Project name and scope, outcomes, granting organization, amount awarded Describe the purpose, impact, and the outcomes

Internal Grants and Awards for Research / Creative Activities

Year Project name and scope, outcomes, granting organization, amount awarded Describe the purpose, impact, and the outcomes

Service Related to Research / Creative Activities

Year Board/agency/journal/organization/professional society and role, e.g. expert consultant, referee, editor, leadership position, etc.

List them as service to the professional organization, invited journal article review, invited to contribute to an exhibition, etc.

Recognition for Research / Creative Activities

Year Awards, honors, recognitions, highlight if nominated.

TEACHING

Courses Taught

List courses taught in last five years, using a tabular format, using headings below, beginning with the most recent semester.

Semester	Course	Course	Course title	Enrollment	Percent of course
and Year	#	Credit Hours			for which responsible
		TIOUIS			Tesponsible

Undergraduate Advising

Describe undergraduate advising responsibilities. Describe your role as a mentor for undergraduate students. Include mentoring honors student projects, undergraduate research, internship supervision, engagement with student clubs and organization, and informal mentoring.

Graduate Advising

Major Professor

Year Student name, degree earned, thesis/creative component title, link to the thesis

Graduate Committee Member

Year Student name, degree earned, thesis/creative component title, link to the thesis

Student Awards

Year Student name, award received for work done under your supervision, link to the award

Student Accomplishments

Year Student name, accomplishment under your supervision

Curricular Development

Year Significant contribution to curriculum, new course developed, etc. Provide the reason for the new course development, its content, and its connection to your scholarship, if relevant.

Grants for Teaching

Year Project name and scope, granting organization, amount awarded

Service related to Teaching

Year Organization and role

Recognition for Teaching

Year Awards, honors, recognitions for teaching/advising

Professional Development related to Teaching

Year Organization, project name and scope, activities and responsibilities taken on

INSTITUTIONAL SERVICE

(Examples include the following. Refer to <u>FH</u> 5.3.1.4.4., College of Design Governance Document, and Departmental Documents for further examples.)

University Service

Year Council/committee/activity and role, e.g., member, chair, contribution, etc.

College Service

Year Council/committee/activity and role, e.g., member, chair, contribution, etc.

Departmental Service

Year Council/committee/activity and role, e.g., member, chair, contribution, etc.

Recognitions for Institutional Service

Year Awards, honors, recognitions for service activities

Professional Service

Year Council/committee/activity and role, e.g., member, chair, contribution, etc.

SECTION II. DOCUMENTATION of CANDIDATE'S PERFORMANCE in POSITION RESPONSIBILITIES

The candidate should prepare this section. Please be as concise as possible. **This section must not exceed 10 pages**.

 Teaching Statement: Provide a summary of efforts related to teaching since the initial appointment at ISU/last promotion or review, as well as information on teaching quality and impact. Describe efforts to improve your teaching over time, including professional development related to teaching, course and curriculum development, and innovative teaching strategies to improve student engagement and outcomes. Explain how you have assessed effectiveness in your teaching responsibilities, through peer teaching evaluations, assessments of student learning or other feedback. This narrative provides context for the student end-of-semester course evaluations. The teaching narrative may include a discussion of the impact of Covid-19 on the candidate's teaching.

This section should also include Course Evaluation Data. Please request this from your departmental partner.

- 2. **Performance in Service Responsibilities:** Institutional service may include committee or other service at the department, college, or university levels. It may also include activities not captured below, to advance campus-wide goals, such as faculty mentoring, student success, innovation and entrepreneurship, international engagement, and creating a welcoming and supportive environment. Term faculty members may be involved in service to their disciplines, such as service in national organizations and service as reviewers for journals or research panels. The extent and impact of such service can be discussed here.
- 3. Performance in Scholarship Substantially Done at ISU since Appointment (required if part of the PRS, otherwise optional): This section should not be a verbatim repetition of the material listed in the CV but should place the scholarship in context within the overall stock of knowledge, how it contributes to the advance of knowledge, and how it has been recognized and utilized by peer audiences. Scholarship may occur in the areas of teaching and research/creative activities. Although the nature and evidence of scholarship varies somewhat across these scholarly domains and across departments in the college, there are at least three common features of all types of scholarship. A critical feature of all scholarship is that it produces products, often referred to as intellectual property, that are shared with appropriate audiences (e.g., as a journal article, book chapter, book, exhibit, software program, musical score, professional presentation, performance etc.). A second important feature of all scholarship is that it is subject to "peer review," a critical evaluation of the product by those qualified to judge it. Finally, scholarship demonstrates a solid foundation and visibility in one's field and original contributions to that field. The research narrative may include a discussion of the impact of Covid-19 on your research program. Please address the significance of your scholarship, comment on the quality and impact of your work, and clarify your role in work that was done collaboratively with others. Please provide a summary of scholarship in progress, how it relates to past scholarship, and your plans for future scholarship.

SECTION III. DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW and RECOMMENDATIONS

Department Review and Recommendation:

This section provides a description of the review process, the department's recommendation and the department's reasons for the recommended action. The department should specifically address the candidate's excellence (or lack of excellence) in the areas reflected in the PRS.

Complete only those sections relevant to the PRS. PLEASE NOTE: External review letters for all term faculty are NOT part of the advancement process and should not be solicited.

- 1. Description of the review process in the department (including information on the department faculty review committee conducting the review and the department process for conducting peer review of teaching).
- 2. Assessment of performance in teaching: Drawing on the materials presented in Section 2, the department is expected to analyze the candidate's performance in position responsibilities and, wherever possible, submit documentation to support the evaluation and place the candidate's performance in a comparative framework. Evaluations should focus on the quality of performance as well as the quantity of work performed in each area. Whenever possible, place candidate's materials in a comparative framework.

In addition to an evaluation of the candidate's contribution to the teaching mission of the department, this assessment must include: 1) discussion of student ratings of teaching, including comparison to departmental norms (a synthesis and evaluation of student comments may be helpful, but do not include pages of verbatim student comments); 2) discussion of reports from peer observations of teaching, including classroom observations and the review of teaching materials.

- 3. Assessment of performance in Institutional service (if part of the PRS)
- 4. Assessment of performance in professional service (if part of the PRS)
- 5. Assessment of performance in professional practice (if part of the PRS)
- 6. Assessment of performance in scholarship (if part of the PRS): Drawing on the materials in Section 2, the department is expected to evaluate the quantity, quality, impact and trajectory of scholarship. Wherever possible, submit documentation to support the evaluation and place candidate's performance in a comparative framework. Although this narrative should include summaries of completed, current, and future scholarship, the evaluation should focus on both the quality and the quantity of scholarship. The criteria used should be appropriate to the advancement being considered.
- 7. Future development and prospects: Include an assessment of the candidate's prospects for future development and the basis for this assessment. Also, include a detailed programmatic justification ("role in the department and beyond"). Provide reasons for recommending advancement, including a summary of how the candidate meets the criteria for advancement.
- 8. Department Review Committee's Vote

Please record the committee vote below or check the "No Vote Taken" box.

Yes _____ # No _____ # Abstain _____ # Absent _____ #No Vote Taken _____

Department Chair Review and Recommendation: The Chair's statement should not simply be a restatement of the report of the department's review committee; it should include the chair's critical analysis and weighing of the evidence for and against advancement in a manner that makes evident the thinking and rationale underlying the chair's recommendation.

9. Chair's Recommendation

Yes _____ No _____

Voting Record on Term Faculty Advancement Case

The Dean's Office is responsible for reviewing and finalizing this voting record after the candidate's file has been routed through the department and the college. Deans (or their designated administrative support person) are responsible for the accuracy of the information presented. Follow the departmental and college governance document process.

	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent	On Leave
Departmental Committee (Indicate total votes)					
Department Chair Recommendation					
Dean's Cabinet (Indicate total votes)					
Dean's Recommendation					

Revised April 17, 2024